

**REMARKS**

Claims 9, 12, 14, and 15 are pending in the present application. It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

With respect to the objection to claims 12 and 14, claims 12 and 14 have been amended so as to obviate the present objection.

Withdrawal of the objection to claims 12 and 14 is therefore respectfully requested.

With respect to the objection of claims 14 and 15, while Applicant does not necessarily agree with the merits of the objection, to facilitate matters, claim 14 has been amended herein without prejudice to obviate the objection.

Withdrawal of the objection to claims 14 and 15 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,536,724 (“Hasegawa”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,990,761 (“Hamparian”).

Claim 12 recites “*nodes of the cathodes lying between outside terminals are connected via at least one of resistors and inductors to the cathodes of the varactor diodes whose cathodes form a first outside terminal and a second outside terminal of the alternative circuit; and nodes of the anodes lying between the outside terminals being connected to one of resistors and inductors whose second terminals form a control voltage terminal for supplying the control voltage to set the capacitance.*”

Thus, claim 12 clearly provides that nodes of the cathodes between outside terminals are connected, via at least one of resistors and inductors, to *cathodes that form first and second outside terminals*. Further, nodes of the anodes between outside terminals are connected, via one of resistors and inductors, to a control voltage terminal.

In support of the rejection, the Office Action cites to Figure 4 of Hasegawa, which shows a circuit with an input terminal thereof connected to cathodes via a pair of inductors. In contrast to the subject matter of claim 12, Hasegawa does not disclose first and second outside terminals that are formed by cathodes. The input terminal of Hasegawa is not formed by a cathode, but rather a conventional terminal for receiving electrical input. Moreover, the input terminal is connected to an inductor and therefore cannot possibly be construed as being formed by a cathode. As a result, Hasegawa also fails to disclose or

suggest a cathode-to-cathode connection, e.g., a connection, via at least one of resistors and inductors, from cathodes between outside terminals, to cathodes that form first and second outside terminals, as provided for in claim 12.

Additionally, the Office Action conclusorily asserts that the ground connections to which anodes of Hasegawa's circuit are connected, constitute a control voltage. This conclusion however, cannot hold because the control voltage is provided via the input terminal, not the ground terminals. As described in Hasegawa, a DC control voltage is received *through a control terminal connected to an inductor*, e.g., the input terminal previously discussed, to change the capacitance of varactor diodes connected thereto (column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 3; Figure 1A, reference numeral 21). The ground terminals do not function to set capacitance and therefore cannot possibly be considered control voltage terminals.

Hamparian does not disclose or suggest (nor has Hamparian been alleged to disclose) “*nodes of the cathodes lying between outside terminals are connected via at least one of resistors and inductors to the cathodes of the varactor diodes whose cathodes form a first outside terminal and a second outside terminal of the alternative circuit; and nodes of the anodes lying between the outside terminals being connected to one of resistors and inductors whose second terminals form a control voltage terminal for supplying the control voltage to set the capacitance.*”

Therefore, the combination of Hasegawa and Hamparian does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 12, so that the combination of Hasegawa and Hamparian does not render unpatentable claim 12 or its dependent claims, e.g., claim 9.

Claim 14 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 12. Accordingly, claim 14 and its dependent claim 15 are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above in support of the patentability of claim 12.

Accordingly, all of pending claims 9, 12, 14, and 15 are allowable.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of pending claims 9, 12, 14, and 15 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections and rejections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 1, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/  
Clifford A. Ulrich, Reg. No. 42,194 for  
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**